

### **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of August 22, 2006 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims because of their dependency on cancelled claim 2; this has been remedied above.


The Examiner further stated that it was unclear as to the further distinction provided by the word "slidably." It is initially noted that the wording in claims 17 and 20 has been changed to simply "slidable" by the above in the hope that this will remedy the concern raised by the Examiner. It is secondly noted that whether or not applicant is relying upon "slidably" to distinguish over the prior art is not an issue that relates to definiteness. It is lastly noted that the distinction raised by this limitation with respect to the cited prior art was thoroughly discussed in the last response.

Accordingly it is believed and submitted that all of the rejections raised by the Examiner have been addressed and overcome at this point. Indication of such is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is requested to pass the case to issue. If the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Yusuke AKAMI et al.

By: 

Nils E. Pedersen

Registration No. 33,145

Attorney for Applicants

NEP/krp  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 22, 2006